

REMARKS

The specification is amended to conform to the preferred layout for a specification of a utility application. More specifically, an abstract and various headings are added. No new matter has been added.

The claims have been amended to conform to U.S. practice. More specifically, referenced numerals appearing in claims 1 – 12 and 16 have been deleted.

Claims 1, 3 – 6, and 8 – 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo “Improving module reuse by interface adaptation,” p. 208 – 217. Specifically, the Examiner stated (among others):

As to claim 1, Purtilo teaches a running time system (system can create an execution-time module, p. 208, col. 2, paragraph 1), several components (component, p. 210, col. 2, paragraph 3), data acquisition (calling module, p. 210, paragraph 4), data disposal (called module, p. 210, paragraph 1), independent of program-defined interfaces (Nimble can create a new actual interface, p. 210, paragraph 5).

Claim 1 recites data acquisition and data disposal steps that are “independent of program-defined interfaces in said second component.” On the contrary, Purtilo teaches that the “new actual interface” created using NIMBLE is dependent upon both the calling and called modules’ parametric interfaces. More specifically, Purtilo states “with the description of these two interface patterns available, the programmer can then use NIMBLE to create a new actual interface pattern.” Purtilo further states: “once a map has been constructed by the programmer, and its consistency checked, the NIMBLE translator will generate an operational specification for transforming the original actual interface pattern into the programmer-defined interface pattern.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Purtilo fails to teach or suggest data acquisition and data disposal “independent of program-defined interfaces in said second component” as recited by claim 1.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

Claims 3 – 6 and 8 – 9 depend from allowable claim 1. Thus, it is believed that claims 3 – 6 and 8 – 9 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 – 6 and 8 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

As to claim 10, the Examiner states:

Purtilo teaches docking points (annotated actual parameter list is provided, p. 210, col. 2, paragraph 5), at least one docking point was found by entering call information (pick and choose, p. 210, col. 2, paragraph 5) about the further component at each docking point found.

Claim 10 recites “b) modifying the components of the program component system where at least one docking point was found, by entering call information about the further component at each docking point found.” It is respectfully submitted that Purtilo fails to teach modifying the components of the program component system.

On the contrary, Purtilo states:

Our system provides a *translator* which takes the NIMBLE specification map and creates an execution-time module to actually perform the coercion during each invocation. This constructed module contains code for extracting the necessary arguments from the actual parameter list, creating a new parameter list (meeting NIMBLE specifications), and completing the invocation with the new parameter list.

(p. 208, col. 2, paragraph 1) (emphasis in original). It is respectfully submitted that Purtilo does not teach or suggest modifying the actual parameter list. Purtilo teaches creating an execution time module (for each invocation) having the appropriate code for extracting the necessary arguments from the actual parameter list, however, the actual parameter list is not modified.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

Claims 11 – 13 depend from allowable claim 10. Thus, it is believed that claims 11 – 13 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11 – 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo “Improving module reuse by interface adaptation;” p. 208 – 217, in view of Craze (U.S. Pat. No.: 5,809,564).

Claim 2 recites “data transmitted during the data acquisition are transferred from a memory image portion of said second component into a transfer data region of said first component, and/or that the data transmitted during the data disposal are transferred from a transfer data region of said first component into a memory image portion of said second component.”

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has misinterpreted the teachings of Craze. Column 4, lines 1 – 20 of Craze discusses a stack data structure (i.e., a last-in, first-out memory structure) and its relation to a heap data structure. Craze states:

the Macintosh system functionally adds and removes items on the stack by updating a stack pointer. When a function calls another function, the Central Processing Unit (CPU) of the Macintosh system stores, or pushes the return address of the calling function into the next available memory location on the

Appl. No. 09/582,771
Amdt. Dated: 11 June 2003
Reply to Office action dated: 12 March 2003

stack. This return address identifies the location in the application heap where the CPU should continue processing when the called function returns to the calling function.

(column 4, lines 1- 9.) It is respectfully submitted that Craze fails to teach or suggest that data is transmitted between the stack and the heap.

Furthermore, claims 2 and 7 depend from allowable claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to illustrate that Craze supplies the teachings missing from Purtilo for claim 1. Thus for the same reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, it is believed that claims 2 and 7 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Purtilo in view of Craze be withdrawn.

Claims 14 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo “Improving module reuse by interface adaptation;” p. 208 – 217, in view of Dievendorff (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,425,017).

Claims 14 – 16 depend from allowable claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to illustrate that Dievendorff supplies the teachings missing from Purtilo for claim 10. Thus for the same reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 10, it is believed that claims 14 – 16 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Purtilo in view of Dievendorff be withdrawn.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1 – 16 is earnestly requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than by allowance, he is respectfully requested to contact applicants’ attorney at the phone number listed below so that additional changes to the claims may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted



Richard J. Coldren
Reg. No. 44,084
Thorp Reed & Armstrong, LLP
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425
(412) 394-2442

Dated: 11 June 2003

Attorneys for Applicants